

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE	<table border="1"> <tr> <td><i>Serial Number</i></td><td>09/788,339</td></tr> <tr> <td><i>Filing Date</i></td><td>02/21/2001</td></tr> <tr> <td><i>First Named Inventor</i></td><td>Sadaji Tsuge</td></tr> <tr> <td><i>Group Art Unit</i></td><td>1725</td></tr> <tr> <td><i>Examiner Name</i></td><td>A.Kollias</td></tr> <tr> <td><i>Attorney Docket Number</i></td><td>TOR.001.0001NP</td></tr> </table>	<i>Serial Number</i>	09/788,339	<i>Filing Date</i>	02/21/2001	<i>First Named Inventor</i>	Sadaji Tsuge	<i>Group Art Unit</i>	1725	<i>Examiner Name</i>	A.Kollias	<i>Attorney Docket Number</i>	TOR.001.0001NP
<i>Serial Number</i>	09/788,339												
<i>Filing Date</i>	02/21/2001												
<i>First Named Inventor</i>	Sadaji Tsuge												
<i>Group Art Unit</i>	1725												
<i>Examiner Name</i>	A.Kollias												
<i>Attorney Docket Number</i>	TOR.001.0001NP												
<i>Title of the Invention:</i> SOLAR CELL MODULE													

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION UNDER 37 CFR § 1.111

This is a response to the Office action mailed June 8, 2011. A three-month extension of time for response from September 8, 2011 to December 8, 2011 is requested. Further reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the following remarks.

35 U.S.C. § 112 First Paragraph Rejection

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 16, 18 – 20 and 28 – 30 as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement is requested. The rejection is based on the assertion that there is no support in the specification for the “open ended range” of “at least 3 $\mu\text{mg/g}$ (*sic*, 3 $\mu\text{g/g}$) of sodium ions” as recited in the claims.

Specifically, claim 16 is rejected on the basis that, according to the Examiner, the specification discloses only “3 $\mu\text{mg/g}$ (*sic*, 3 $\mu\text{g/g}$) sodium concentration, not a range of concentrations, and that such sodium concentration is disclosed only with respect to alleged “PVF resin.” This position is respectfully submitted to be in error.

First, the disclosure in the specification at pages 5-6 of particular preparations of different solar cell modules prepared to examine a cause of degradation of power generation performance, relates to conventional solar cell modules such as shown in Fig. 4. The specification clearly describes Fig. 4 as illustrating the conventional solar cell module, not an embodiment of the invention (which is shown in Figs. 1 and 2).

Second, the conventional solar cell modules described at page 6 are only examples, and not exclusive structures. As explained at page 8, the transparent plastic film may be made of any of a large number of materials, including PET, PVDF, FEP, ETFE, PC, PVC or PMMA, in addition to PVF.